

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. MARSH) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WHAT'S BEHIND THE HARLEM RIOTS

(Mr. WAGGONNER (at the request of Mr. MARSH) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened for a week now to the pious statements of the mob leaders in New York City. Every possible excuse has been dredged up to explain, condone, sympathize, and remove the responsibility for the mass terror the rioters have brought to the Nation's largest city. Finally, the real reason has been nailed to the wall by Reporter Jimmy Breslin writing in Friday, July 24, Washington Post.

They are not rioting for jobs, votes, in memory of the knife wielding attacker James Powell, or for any of the other high-flown reasons some would have us believe.

As Mr. Breslin puts it, "They riot in the streets for themselves."

Here is Mr. Breslin's full account.

Again, I say that those who supported street riots as a legitimate exercise of freedom, who have promoted civil disobedience and encouraged what is now taking place in New York City, can wash their hands like Pilate and cry out that no man's blood is upon them, but they cannot escape this responsibility.

The article referred to follows:

(By Jimmy Breslin)

NEW YORK, July 23.—This afternoon, everybody was getting ready for the fifth straight night of rioting in New York City and by now, the name of James Powell is so far in the background that it is only a symbol. A faint symbol, because you wonder how many of these kids who are running in the streets even know James Powell's name. These kids who have made this the worst week in the history of the city of New York have not done it for the memory of anybody.

They riot in the streets for themselves. You could see that this afternoon, in a place called Dean's Discount Land, which is a store on Broadway in Brooklyn.

The kid came off the hot street and into the store with long steps and his shoulders riding up and down. When nobody came over to take care of him, he began to snap his fingers.

"Say there," he said.

RAINCOAT WANTED

The owner, Jack Lieblein, was at a counter, fixing a pile of shirts. He did not look up. "Say there," the kid said. "Say, my man." "Yes, can I help you?" Lieblein said. "Say there. Say, you know that raincoat you got out in the window there? I like that raincoat. That raincoat fit me pretty good, won't it?"

Lieblein looked up. The kid was thin. He had on plaid bermuda shorts and a blue polo shirt and he was wearing sneakers. His face was almost covered with sunglasses.

"Yes, the raincoat would fit you," Lieblein said. "But that's a display. Over there, we have a whole rack of them in your size. Would you care to look at them?"

THREAT OF LOOTING

"No, I ain't got time now," the kid said. "I be back later and get my coat."

Then the kid gave you the stage wait. Then his mouth opened and the white teeth showed in a big smile.

"Yeah, I be back later. I be back at 1 o'clock in the mornin' and we goin' kick in your window and I take that raincoat right out of your window and wear it home, you white bastard."

The kid broke into a laugh and turned and walked out of the store and back onto Broadway in Brooklyn.

Lieblein went to the phone and called for carpenters. He had his place boarded up and he closed early and went home Thursday night and hoped the police could do something during the night.

"It's up to them," he was saying. "What can I do? It's a police matter."

HOW LONG?

It is. And this is all that it is. These riots by now have nothing to do with civil rights. They are criminal acts and they are being committed by criminals and the most dangerous question of all, as darkness fell Thursday night and the police put on tin helmets, was how long can the police stand in the streets and have bottles thrown at them from rooftops, or iron bars aimed at them from someplace in a dark street? How long are they going to take it?

How long? How long until it rains? How long until thin tempers give away? Or how long until these kids finally back off?

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 45 minutes.

[Mr. LAIRD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

INTER-AMERICAN FOREIGN MINISTERS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. SELDEN was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Pan American Union here in Washington was the scene of an inter-American Foreign Ministers Conference. The meeting, the ninth meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers, resulted from a Venezuelan charge that Cuba was sponsoring subversive activities aimed at overthrowing Venezuela's democratic institutions.

Venezuela accused Cuba of aggression after authorities discovered a 3-ton cache and a plan to use the smuggled weapons to capture the city of Caracas while the Venezuelan Army was guarding polling places throughout the country during elections. Venezuela demanded that sanctions, specified by the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, be invoked against Cuba.

It was my privilege to attend the Foreign Ministers Conference as a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation. The other congressional advisers included Representative WILLIAM MAILLIARD, Re-

publican, of California; Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon; and Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa.

At the Foreign Ministers Conference, there was never any question of Cuba's guilt. Last February a five-nation OAS investigating committee incontestably substantiated Venezuela's charges. The only question facing the Foreign Ministers assembled in Washington was: What should the OAS do in this proven case of Castro-Communist subversion?

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have followed carefully developments in Latin America and often have been critical of the reluctance of the inter-American security system to face up to the threat of Castro communism. Even after Castro's Marxist-Leninist ties were well established, even after 16 American nations had broken relations with Cuba in protest of Castro's machinations in their countries, a number of Latin American nations clung to a narrow interpretation of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. In their legalistic view, the sanctions provided by the Rio Treaty could be invoked only in the case of direct armed aggression.

This limited interpretation of what constitutes "aggression" created a huge gap in the machinery of the inter-American security system. Thus narrowly interpreted, the Rio Treaty—created in 1947 before the Communists had embarked from a hemispheric base on their more subtle tactics of subversion—stood impotent to cope with modern aggressive techniques.

Cuba Congress was well aware that a distinction between old-fashioned "armed aggression" and aggression by subversion was no longer relevant and that both constituted threats to the security of the hemisphere. A joint resolution passed both Houses in late September, 1963—Senate Joint Resolution 230, signed October 3, 1963—which stated:

The United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of the hemisphere.

In early 1963 the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of which I am chairman held hearings to explore the Communist subversive threat in the hemisphere. In our report of April 4, 1963, we found:

Although the inter-American collective security system is prepared to meet the possibility of open military aggression by Communist forces against nations of the hemisphere, no plan for collective action against Communist subversive aggression has been put into effect.

We further stated:

Communist potential for aggression cannot be measured solely in terms of regular military forces of "offensive" capabilities. The fact that Castro Communist forces in Cuba are incapable without outside assistance of mounting successfully a traditional military "offensive" blow in the hemisphere does not minimize the Communist threat to inter-American security.

Prophetically, we noted:

Venezuela is the primary target for Cuban-based Communist subversive aggression.

In its recommendations, the subcommittee stated:

The distinction between "aggressive" and "subversive" activities is without significance. Subversive activities, as conducted by Communist forces in the world today, represent as certain a form of aggression as direct military aggression.

It is recommended that the threat posed by the aggressive capability of Castro Communist subversion be dealt with "by whatever means may be necessary" in the security interests of the United States and all the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

The subcommittee also recommended that "the United States should seek the complete diplomatic and economic quarantine of Communist Cuba by other nations of the hemisphere."

In view of past efforts and frustrations with the inter-American collective security system, it gives me satisfaction to report to you today the outcome of the deliberations of the Foreign Ministers Conference.

The old arguments attempting to distinguish between subversion and aggression were present throughout the meeting. But realism prevailed. The final act of the ninth meeting of consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs at last brings the inter-American security system into the 1960's.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I shall insert the entire final act of the conference. At this time I should like to examine more closely the first resolution, for it is this resolution which finally abandons the anachronistic interpretation of the Rio Treaty and makes the treaty an effective instrument to cope collectively with modern aggression by subversion.

What does the first resolution do? First, it brands subversion committed by Castro's Cuba in Venezuela as aggression, affecting all the member states. Hence, the Rio Treaty is applicable.

Then it proceeds to apply some of the collective sanctions provided for by article 8 of the Rio Treaty. The Foreign Ministers agreed—by a vote of 14 yeas, 4 nays, and 1 abstention—that the American states not maintain diplomatic or consular relations with the Government of Cuba; by a vote of 14 yeas, 4 nays, and 1 abstention, that the governments of the American states suspend their trade, whether direct or indirect, with Cuba, except foodstuffs, medicines, and medical equipment that may be sent to Cuba for humanitarian reasons; and, by a vote of 14 yeas, 3 nays, and 2 abstentions, that the governments of the American states suspend all sea transportation between their countries and Cuba, except for such transportation as may be necessary for reasons of a humanitarian nature. These sanctions are mandatory upon all members of the OAS.

The resolution also contains a statement urging other states "that are animated by the same ideals as the inter-American system to examine the possibility of effectively demonstrating their solidarity in achieving the purposes of

this resolution." In short, the American Republics ask the cooperation of our non-Western Hemisphere allies in making effective the trade quarantine of Castro's Cuba. Hence, we are no longer alone in requesting cooperation of our Western allies. Now, the entire hemisphere regional system is on record in support of the U.S. position in this matter. Furthermore, now that the Latin American Republics themselves have banned trade with Cuba, there no longer remains any ambiguity in the United States pressing countries outside the region to cut off their trade while some Latin American countries themselves engage in it.

The first resolution also warns the Government of Cuba, and I quote:

If it should persist in carrying out acts that possess characteristics of aggression and intervention against one or more of the member states of the Organization, the member states shall preserve their essential rights as sovereign states by the use of self-defense in either individual or collective form, which could go so far as resort to armed force, until such time as the Organ of Consultation takes measures to guarantee the peace and security of the hemisphere.

This measure passed by a vote of 15 in favor, 4 against.

Thus, the inter-American system has solemnly warned Castro and his cohorts that any new attempts to subvert an American Republic can bring quick armed retaliation, without the necessity of prior consultation. This sets the stage for prompt deterrent action.

Throughout the Conference, I have seen press speculation to the effect that condemnation of Castro's Cuba and any sanctions voted, unless secured by unanimous vote or near unanimity, would lose their psychological value and split the hemisphere.

Singlemindedness on complex issues, as we know, is difficult to obtain even in national legislatures. Most legislation requires a simple majority. I would remind Members that the authors of the Rio Treaty, mindful of the seriousness of invoking punitive sanctions against a member state, specified a two-thirds vote rather than a simple majority. The cry, now, for unanimity is indeed a spacious argument.

The final act of the Conference passed by a vote of 15 to 4—Venezuela, having brought the complaint, could not vote. The fact is, then, that the OAS members, by more than the necessary two-thirds vote, have condemned Cuba's subversive acts and invoked both economic and diplomatic sanctions to further quarantine the culprit.

The 26th of July first became significant in hemisphere history as the name of Castro's movement to restore Cuba to democratic processes. With the perversion of the original movement into a tyrannical Communist dictatorship, the 26th of July became synonymous with treachery. The date has again been elevated to an honorable place in the Western Hemisphere. Ironically, it was at 12:15 a.m., Sunday, July 26, 1964, that the American Republics voted to condemn and punish Castro's Communist Cuba—an encouraging step toward the day when the original goals of the 26th

of July will again be the guiding spirit of the Cuban people.

As one who has consistently urged a strong position by both the United States and the Organization of American States with regard to Cuba, I personally will never be satisfied until the Cuban people have been freed from the yoke of communism. However, the resolutions just passed by the American foreign ministers are a welcome step in the direction of that goal.

FINAL ACT—NINTH MEETING OF CONSULTATION OF MINISTERS OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, SERVING AS ORGAN OF CONSULTATION IN APPLICATION OF INTER-AMERICAN TREATY OF RECIPROCAL ASSISTANCE

I. APPLICATION OF MEASURES TO THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT OF CUBA

The ninth meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Serving as Organ of Consultation in Application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

Having seen the report of the Investigating Committee designated on December 3, 1963, by the Council of the Organization of American States, acting provisionally as Organ of Consultation, and

Considering that the said report establishes among its conclusions that "the Republic of Venezuela has been the target of a series of actions sponsored and directed by the Government of Cuba, openly intended to subvert Venezuelan institutions and to overthrow the democratic Government of Venezuela through terrorism, sabotage, assault, and guerrilla warfare," and

That the aforementioned acts, like all acts of intervention and aggression, conflict with the principles and aims of the inter-American system,

Resolves:

1. To declare that the acts verified by the Investigating Committee constitute an aggression and an intervention on the part of the Government of Cuba in the internal affairs of Venezuela, which affects all of the member states.

2. To condemn emphatically the present Government of Cuba for its acts of aggression and of intervention against the territorial inviolability, the sovereignty, and the political independence of Venezuela.

3. To apply, in accordance with the provisions of Articles 6 and 8 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, the following measures:

(a) That the governments of the American states not maintain diplomatic or consular relations with the Government of Cuba;

(b) That the governments of the American states suspend all their trade, whether direct or indirect, with Cuba, except in foodstuffs, medicines, and medical equipment that may be sent to Cuba for humanitarian reasons; and

(c) That the governments of the American states suspend all sea transportation between their countries and Cuba, except for such transportation as may be necessary for reasons of a humanitarian nature.

4. To authorize the Council of the Organization of American States, by an affirmative vote of two thirds of its members, to discontinue the measures adopted in the present resolution at such time as the Government of Cuba shall have ceased to constitute a danger to the peace and security of the hemisphere.

5. To warn the Government of Cuba that if it should persist in carrying out acts that possess characteristics of aggression and intervention against one or more of the member states of the Organization, the member states shall preserve their essential rights as sovereign states by the use of self-defense in either individual or collective form, which could go so far as resort to armed force, un-

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16415

til such time as the Organ of Consultation takes measures to guarantee the peace and security of the hemisphere.

6. To urge those states not members of the Organization of American States that are animated by the same ideals as the Inter-American system to examine the possibility of effectively demonstrating their solidarity in achieving the purposes of this resolution.

7. To instruct the Secretary General of the Organization of American States to transmit to the United Nations Security Council the text of the present resolution, in accordance with the provisions of Article 54 of the United Nations Charter.

II. DECLARATION TO THE PEOPLE OF CUBA

Whereas:

The preamble to the Charter of the Organization of American States declares that, "the historic mission of America is to offer to man a land of liberty, and a favorable environment for the development of his personality and the realization of his just aspirations"; and that "the true significance of American solidarity and good neighborliness can only mean the consolidation on this continent, within the framework of democratic institutions, of a system of individual liberty and social justice based on respect for the essential rights of man";

The Charter of the Organization declares that the solidarity of the American states and the high purposes toward which it is dedicated demand that the political organization of these states be based on the effective exercise of representative democracy;

The Charter also proclaims "the fundamental rights of the individual" and reaffirms that the "education of peoples should be directed toward justice, freedom, and peace";

The Declaration of Santiago, Chile, adopted by the Fifth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs and signed by the present Cuban Government, proclaimed that the faith of peoples of America in the effective exercise of representative democracy is the best vehicle for the promotion of their social and political progress (Resolution XCV of the Tenth Inter-American Conference), while well-planned and intensive development of the economies of the American countries and improvement in the standard of living of their peoples represent the best and firmest foundation on which the practical exercise of democracy and the stabilization of their institutions can be established;

The Ninth International Conference of American States condemned "the methods of every system tending to suppress political and civil rights and liberties, and in particular the action of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine";

The present Government of Cuba, identifying itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system alien to the democratic and Christian traditions of the American family of nations and contrary to the principles of juridical organization upon which rest the security and peaceful harmonious relations of the peoples of the hemisphere; and

The exclusion of the present Government of Cuba from participation in the Inter-American system, by virtue of the provisions of Resolution VI of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, by no means signifies any intention to deny the Cuban people their rightful place in the community of American peoples;

The Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Serving as Organ of Consultation in Application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, Declares:

That the free peoples of the Americas are convinced that the Inter-American system

offers to the Cuban people unequalled conditions for the realization of their ideals of peace, liberty, and social and economic progress;

That the peoples belonging to the Inter-American system are in complete sympathy with the Cuban people in all their sufferings, in the face of the total loss of their liberty both in the spiritual domain and in the social and economic field, the denial of their most elementary human rights, the burden of their persecutions, and the destruction of a legal system that was open to improvement and that offered the possibility of stability; and

That, within this spirit of solidarity, the free peoples of America cannot and must not remain indifferent to or uninterested in the fate of the noble Cuban people, which is oppressed by a dictatorship that renounces the Christian and democratic traditions of the American peoples; and in consequence Expresses:

1. Its profound concern for the fate of the brother people of Cuba.

2. Its deepest hope that the Cuban people, strengthened by confidence in the solidarity with them of the other American peoples and governments, will be able, by their own endeavor, very soon to liberate themselves from the tyranny of the Communist regime that oppresses them and to establish in that country a government freely elected by the will of the people that will assure respect for fundamental human rights.

3. Its firm conviction that the emphatic condemnation of the policy of the present Cuban Government of aggression and intervention against Venezuela will be taken by the people of Cuba as a renewed stimulus for its hope there will come to prevail in that country a climate of freedom that will offer to man in Cuba a favorable environment for the development of his personality and the realization of his just aspirations.

III. REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COORDINATION

Whereas:

The objectives of liberty and democracy that inspire the Inter-American system, threatened as they are by communist subversion, cannot be fully attained if the peoples of the states that compose it lack adequate and sufficient means for bringing about vigorous social progress and better standards of living;

The persistence of a situation in which the world is divided into areas of poverty and plenty is a serious obstacle to any possibility that may present itself in the American hemisphere for achieving an economically more just society;

Harmonious and decisive action is indispensable, in both the regional and the international spheres, to combat the causes of economic underdevelopment and social backwardness, since prosperity and world peace based on the freedom of man cannot be achieved unless all the American countries attain equality in the economic and social field;

In particular, the continued existence of such a state of underdevelopment and poverty among large sectors of mankind, which becomes more acute in spite of the world increase in wealth and the advance of science and technology from which these sectors cannot derive full benefit; encourages the subversive action of international communism;

The countries of Latin America expressed their aspirations in the Charter of Alta Gracia and declared their determined intention to work together to build a better world in which there will be a more equitable distribution of income;

The Conference on Trade and Development, held recently in Geneva, provided a forum for a full discussion of the problems of international economics and established

the basis for adequate solutions to problems arising in the fields of raw materials, manufactured products, and international financing; and

The Instruments adopted at the two aforementioned meetings supplement and perfect those signed at the Special Meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council held at Punta del Este in August 1961, and especially, the Charter of Punta del Este,

The Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Serving as Organ of Consultation in Application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

Declares: That the aims of unity and peace with liberty and democracy pursued in the struggle against international communism, which threatens the stability of the institutions of the Inter-American system and of the countries that compose it, must be achieved by eliminating those obstacles that hinder social progress and economic development, and

Resolves:

1. To reaffirm the determined will of their peoples to work, in the regional and international spheres, for the achievement of the objectives expressed in the Charter of Alta Gracia and at the Conference on Trade and Development, which are in line with the aims and purposes of the Alliance for Progress.

2. To request the Inter-American Economic and Social Council to continue the necessary studies in order to find adequate solutions to the problems involved.

IV. DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS AMONG THE MEMBER STATES

The Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Serving as Organ of Consultation in Application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

Resolves: To transmit to the Council of the Organization of American States the draft resolution "Diplomatic Relations Among the Member States," presented by the Delegation of Argentina (Document No. 30, Rev. 2).

V. VOTE OF RECOGNITION

The Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Serving as Organ of Consultation in Application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

Resolves: To congratulate His Excellency Mr. Vasco Leitão da Cunha, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Brazil, on the wise and intelligent manner in which he guided the deliberations of the Meeting.

VI. VOTE OF THANKS

The Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Serving as Organ of Consultation in Application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

Resolves:

1. to express to His Excellency Mr. José A. Mora, Secretary General of the Organization of American States, its appreciation for all the attentions and courtesies extended to the delegates in connection with this Meeting.

2. To place on record its gratitude to the Secretary General of the Meeting, Mr. William Sanders, and to all who collaborated with him, for the manner in which the advisory and secretariat services of the Meeting were organized and carried out.

3. To offer its appreciation to the hemisphere and world press and other information media for the efficient service they rendered to the Meeting.

STATEMENTS

Statement of Chile

The Delegation of Chile abstained from voting on paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part of Resolution I, because of its

doubts regarding the legality of the use of the term "aggression" in describing the acts. It voted negatively on paragraph 3, because it is firmly convinced that the measures agreed to are not appropriate to the particular case that has brought about the application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. It also voted against paragraph 5, because it believes that there are discrepancies between the provisions of that paragraph and those of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and of Article 8 of the Rio Treaty. With reference to its abstention on paragraph 6, its attitude is consistent with the attitude taken with respect to the measures called for in paragraph 3.

The Delegation of Chile abstained from voting on the Declaration to the People of Cuba since, although agreeing with its basic content, it maintains relations with the Republic of Cuba and since it believes precisely in the principle of nonintervention, it has deemed it preferable not to give positive support to this resolution.

Statement of Mexico

The Delegation of Mexico wishes to make it a matter of record in the Final Act, that the Government of Mexico:

1. Is convinced that the measures provided for in the third paragraph of the operative part of Resolution I (which the Delegation of Mexico voted against) lack foundation inasmuch as the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance does not envisage, in any part, the application of such measures in situations of the kind and nature dealt with by this Meeting of Consultation.

2. Makes a specific reservation to the fifth paragraph of the operative part of the same resolution since it endeavors to extend, in such a way as to be incompatible with the provisions of Articles 3 and 10 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, the right to individual or collective self-defense.

3. Reiterates without reservations its "will to cooperate permanently in the fulfillment of the principles and purposes of a policy of peace," to which "is essentially related" the "obligation of mutual assistance and common defense of the American Republics," in accordance with the provisions of paragraph five of the Preamble of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

In witness whereof, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs sign the present final act.

Done in the Pan American Union, Washington, D.C., United States of America, in the four official languages of the Organization, on July 26, 1964. The Secretary General shall deposit the original of the final act in the archives of the Pan American Union, which will transmit the authenticated copies thereof to the governments of the American republics.

For Chile:
For Colombia:
For Bolivia:
For Guatemala:
For Venezuela:
For Brazil:
For El Salvador:
For Uruguay:
For the Dominican Republic:
For Ecuador:
For Costa Rica:
For Paraguay:
For Haiti:
For Nicaragua:
For Panama:
For Mexico:
For Peru:
For the United States of America:
For Argentina:
For Honduras:

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD),

also a member of the Advisory Group who attended the Conference of Foreign Ministers.

Mr. MAILLIARD. May I say that I would like to commend the gentleman from Alabama for the statement he has made, and in which I concur, and also to add, after having attended the meetings held during the past week, that while in connection with the end results perhaps each of us could have added something, and each of us may have had our own ideas and may not be in full accord with the resolution that was approved, I think it is an enormous step ahead and it greatly strengthens the Organization of American States.

It gives promise to improvement in the situation as time goes on.

I particularly think that our own representatives, the Secretary of State, as well as Assistant Secretary Mann and Ambassador Bunker, are deserving of thanks for the effective way in which they functioned during the negotiations at this meeting.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I inquire of the gentleman if, in his opinion, in view of the fact that certain nations seem to adopt the attitude that they are not interested in protecting the United States in the situation we have in Cuba, our AID people will now begin to tighten the purse strings a little bit and keep the American eagle flying down there so that they will not build up the economy of those five nations. Evidently they are not in sympathy with anything we are doing and not in sympathy with the democratic process of government. I wonder if now there will be some movement on the part of the people in charge of the programs down there to forget the nations that forgot about us and aid the nations that have not.

Mr. SELDEN. The resolution that was adopted is mandatory. I would hope the nations who voted against it will comply with its mandatory provisions. However, as far as the gentleman's question is concerned, that decision will be made by the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. MAILLIARD. If the gentleman will yield, just to correct the record, the gentleman from Florida said five nations voted against the resolution. There were only four. There were 15 votes for the resolution and 4 against it on the final vote. Under the rule, Venezuela, that brought the charges against Castro, was not allowed to vote at all. So there were only four votes against it. I share with the gentleman from Alabama the hope that since this is mandatory these nations will do what they are obligated to do. I am hopeful that two will comply promptly, and possibly the other two also.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that Mexico was one of the four

countries that refused to vote for the resolution?

Mr. SELDEN. There were four nations that voted against it. They were Mexico, Bolivia, Chile, and Uruguay.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for his statement, but I must say I am deeply disappointed that Mexico, which has been in all too many respects a transmission belt into Cuba, declined to join in this movement against Cuba. I only regret that the bill that came before the House, I believe it was a week ago today, that provided some recognition on the part of the United States for Mexico, has been passed. Certainly no bill of that nature could pass the House under unanimous consent today in view of the Mexican attitude toward Cuba. I am very disappointed that Mexico refused to vote against the repudiation of Cuban communism in Central and South America. In my opinion, the Mexican Government could have done far better in their relationship with this country than this.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. I would like to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. SELDEN) for bringing to the attention of the House the action taken over the weekend by the Organization of American States against Cuba. I must express, too, regret that there are some nations that still do not see the situation as we do. I trust they will abide by the sanctions, however. I must express some satisfaction that we have made some progress. The situation is improving, and I am pleased we finally have taken further steps in the right direction after too much delay.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. As a member of the subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, I welcome the opportunity to listen to his report which he makes as one of the congressional observers at this ninth Foreign Ministers meeting of the Organization of American States.

I want to compliment him for the years of personal interest that he has had in this entire problem of Cuba and Latin America, and also specifically for the time and effort which he and his counterpart on the other side of the aisle have spent in attending this conference.

I want to get a plug in here now for the continuation of the system which allows Members of Congress to attend these international meetings. As I recall, this has not always been the case. But if my memory serves me correctly, under the last administration the gentlemen from Alabama and some other Members of the Congress from both Houses attended the conference at Punta Del Este. There was a feeling in the Congress that very realistic assistance could be provided Members of Congress even though they would

not be official members of the U.S. delegation. Of course, as history has shown, this was very true with respect to the conference at Punta Del Este. The Members of the Congress there also made a very significant contribution to the deliberations. I know that the efforts of Members of Congress at this recent Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States, aided and reinforced the excellent work of the U.S. delegation.

I want to commend the administration for its realistic approach in allowing Members of Congress to participate in these meetings as part of the U.S. delegation. We would trust that this will continue to be a useful instrumentality for future conduct of these meetings. Does not the gentleman from Alabama agree and would he like to say something on this point?

Mr. SELDEN. I agree with the views of the gentleman from Florida that the presence of Members of Congress from both Houses has been helpful to the delegation of the United States in the two last conferences of Foreign Ministers which I had the privilege to attend. I am convinced the Members present were able to effectively pass on to the representatives of the executive branch, as well as to the delegates from other nations, the ideas of the Congress and of the people.

Mr. FASCELL. I appreciate the gentlemen's remarks. If the gentleman would yield further, I would trust that this kind of cooperative effort will continue. We believe it is not only extremely helpful to the executive branch of the Government but we know it is very, very helpful to the Members of Congress in getting a better understanding not only of what the executive is doing and is trying to do, but also as to what the Congress seeks to do and what its feelings may be on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to associate myself with the remarks made by the able and distinguished gentleman from Alabama in his report to this House. As one who has also been critical not only of U.S. policy but of lack of action by the Organization of American States, I must say that the action taken by the foreign ministers is to be commended as realistic and a strong forward step in dealing with the problem of communism in the Western Hemisphere and the Castro government particularly. I can remember the time when the question was raised and not only by me but by many others as to whether the Organization of American States could survive the Castro's communism and whether it was just a paper organization because of its lack of action.

This is not now the case. Significant recent events have indicated clearly to all people—particularly to the Castro government and to Castro himself—that the Organization of American States is indeed not a paper organization but is an organization of action, willing to move and desirous of meeting the problems in the Western Hemisphere, and determined to eliminate the Communist government of Cuba and communism in the Western Hemisphere.

The Conference at Punta del Este was one of those, outlining the broad base of

principle for support of economic and social reforms and the Alliance for Progress. When the American countries acted unanimously in support of the blockade of Cuba during the missile crisis in 1963 was another instance.

This recent action of the ninth Conference of Foreign Ministers is the most recent significant event which shows that the inter-American system, as represented by the Organization of American States, the oldest organization of its kind, is vital and active and prepared to deal with problems on a strong and realistic basis.

Nothing demonstrates more eloquently the significance of this concerted action, this two-pronged offensive, and its effectiveness than the reaction of self-professed Communist Castro. His cries—we might say squeals—indicate that a vital spot has been hit. The recent words of condemnation by the Communist leader of the government in Cuba brings that point home strongly.

It is one thing to vilify the United States and its Government because of its policies or actions. But the sound of damnation has even a more hollow sound when the railings are against the action of the other Latin Republics. The proven charges were brought by a Latin American Republic and the American countries responded by adopting a policy of isolating the offending government as a cancer in the Western Hemisphere and as a danger to freedom and liberty. The political and economic significance of this action certainly has not been lost on the head of the Government of Cuba. We should not minimize in any way the tremendous impact which the diplomatic and economic sanctions taken by the Organization of American States and by a great majority of the Latin governments against the Government of Cuba.

Furthermore, for the first time in the inter-American system, and perhaps anywhere in international organizations, governments have gotten together to reach an agreement that subversion, as practiced by the Communists, is as aggressive and hostile as armed aggression. This is certainly a major step in dealing with the problem in the Western Hemisphere through the OAS since it requires no further meeting of consultation in that body in order to take any action for future aggressive and subversive acts by the Castro government. The warning is clear that force can and will be used if necessary.

This is not lost, either, upon the head of the Government of Cuba, as he pronounces his purpose of subverting and of destroying all the existing democratic governments in Latin America in order to conform them to his system of government by dictatorship.

An interesting political gambit occurs. In his speech, the head of the Communist Government of Cuba was very critical of the others heads of government in Latin America because they took this recent action concertedly to protect their own governments and freedom, liberty, and democracy in the Western Hemisphere; and, because the United States had a single vote in this matter, he called the action of these sovereign American countries the act of colonies conceding to

the imperialistic designs of the Yankee Government of the United States.

What would he call these leaders and their governments had they not fought Castro's design to subvert all other governments and make them Communist reprints? Latin American governments are very sovereign and justifiably proud of their fight for freedom, social and economic justice. They do not need a Communist dictator to aid them by destroying all concepts of individual dignity and freedom. Some people are critical that the vote in the OAS was not unanimous. Of course, I would like to have had such a vote. But is not this indicative of the sovereign right of diversity? After all, free people act freely and democratically, sometimes they even disagree when their interests are identical.

Is not this democratic way better than to be clubbed into submission the way Castro wants to do it?

Mr. Speaker, we should not forget that the head of the Communist government of Cuba and other Communists make their appeal to the people of the world by saying that they are going to bring about desirable political, social, and economic reforms, and that the end justifies the means—that you can do it any way at all, just so you get it done. They will engage in violence and subversion, in lies and deceit, in every known method, including killing, to accomplish their purpose. The majority of free and democratic people in this country and elsewhere have never subscribed to this unholy principle to achieve political dominance, either at home and abroad, and I hope they never will. We will fight and die when necessary to preserve our beliefs but we still adhere to the concepts of ethics, morality, religion, difference of opinion, the worth and dignity of the individual, and the orderly transfer of power within our governmental system embracing these concepts.

In dealing with the obvious social and economic reforms in Latin America, the United States and other free people and governments in Latin America have, instead of subversion, violence, and Communist conformity, chosen another method. A democratic way; achieved by conference and discourse. I am speaking of the Alliance for Progress, whereby Latin countries and American States have joined together in a massive program of private initiative, governmental assistance to bring about social and economic reforms. With things getting done and spectacular improvements every day, lack of reforms as a Communist rallying cry is becoming less and less effective and there is less appeal for Castro's kind of action which includes subversion, violence, terror, dictatorial conformity, and doing anything to accomplish a purpose. These concepts are those of a government which is dictatorial; a government which has no idea of a constitution; which does not believe in a free press or free speech, individual rights, or a representative form of government. Rather it is a method of government which would seek to crush all people into one mold so as to make all of them do what that dictatorial force wants done. The free and democratic countries of Latin America and the United States in

July 27

this OAS action have taken a strong step for freedom and Castro cries, but I will not be satisfied until the Communist government of Cuba has been replaced with a free and democratic government.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his contributions to this discussion. The gentleman from Florida is a very able member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs and of the full Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have participated in this discussion may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I am sorry I was not here to hear all of the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama, but I would like to reflect, as one person, that I did not feel that the Organization of American States went far enough. I felt that the United States was a party to the definite effort to water down the demands made by Venezuela. I was sorely disturbed to see, for instance, the proposal that air transportation as well as sea transportation with Cuba be prohibited and there be an embargo relating to air transportation as well, was knocked out. If that is not done, then this airline route from Mexico City to Havana remains open and there is a proven clear and open line of subversion that remains open. I thought that was to be one of the key elements of the entire program to be developed at the Organization of American States meeting. That was dropped and we did not fight against their dropping it.

Second, I think the proposal that the wording be continued to maintain recognition rather than initial stronger wording of the proposals is something else that we acceded to. Therefore, I think, yes, there was much done in the right direction, but further I think we did not go far enough and in particular in these two areas I think we should have retained a firm stand.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SELDEN. I am sorry that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] was not here to hear my remarks, because I pointed out that while nothing will satisfy me other than freedom for the Cuban people, I thought the conference had taken some steps in the right direction. The words, "not to maintain" rather than "to break" relations were put in and agreed on by our delegation because there was the possibility that some nations might break relations and then a new government might come in and reestablish those relations. We felt the words "not to maintain" were stronger than the words "to break" and would bind the nations affected until the freedom of the Cuban people was assured. The decision which allows the continuance of air travel to Mexico in-

volves certain security matters which I am not at liberty to discuss. In view of the remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], I thought it was necessary to make this explanation.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I know full well the gentleman's position, and I am certainly not taking issue with him and never have because he does back firm efforts to get rid of Castro's communism in this hemisphere just as many of us on this side do. I would like the Record so to indicate, that I am not taking issue with the gentleman, but I would further like the Record to show that I am very dissatisfied with our lack of firmness as it relates in particular to our failure to cut off airline transportation as well as dealings by sea with Cuba and our failing to fully back Venezuela's demands for a complete economic and political quarantine of Cuba as well as assurances of positive setups to end subversion and arms drops by Cuban Communists.

SUPREME COURT'S DECISION ON REAPPORTIONMENT

(Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. MARSH) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we may be missing the most important point raised by the Supreme Court's decision on apportionment of State senate seats. To me the crucial question raised is this: Are we to become a political society based solely on the quantitative assessment of citizenship? I do not intend to argue over the power of the Court to decide what it has decided. It is not productive to berate the logic or the basis of the decision. I am ready to and have always accepted the reality and the necessity of the principle that elected officials represent people; not cows, not crops, not acres, not arbitrary county lines. What I am not ready or willing to accept is the purely quantitative inference that flows from the deceptive, over-simplified phrase—one man—one vote.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that we pause to inquire of ourselves about the nature of the citizen we represent in the particular. Is this citizen just a unit, a mathematical cipher meaningful only in the significance of his power to vote? Of course not. The citizen has obvious qualitative content as well as qualitative unit measurement. A citizen does not operate in a vacuum. He is part of a physical and geographic environment which he acts upon and reacts to. He is a part of an economic activity, farming, fishing, manufacturing or the like from which he earns a living and acquires strong interests. He is a part of an ethnic group with greater or lesser meaning as to his choices and attitudes. From all of these influences he becomes what he is; his interests are what they are; his relationships with others who share the common boundary of his State. All of these and perhaps other factors determine the attitude and posture of compatibility of legislative interest which prevails on a given measure before his State legislative bodies.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the qualitative nature of the citizen of the several States is entitled to important consideration if the State can find any reasonable formula to determine it. We will all admit that it is far easier to reduce such matters to the simpler approach of numerical consideration. We could argue that some alignment of these qualitative factors would be a byproduct. I have urged in my own State, and I would hope that the Supreme Court decision does not preclude here the argument, that we could make an assignment of Senate seats based on an intelligent appraisal of the geographic, economic, and sociological factors where these have important, observable and rational meaning. We do not thereby suggest that the lower house in any given State is at all times unmindful of such factors; but, we do maintain that apportionment solely of quantity will not necessarily reflect these factors and cannot be said to produce legislative bodies which will always respond to assure a careful, balanced consideration of the contending quality factors within the State.

A plan for apportionment of the Senate should not ignore reflection of some balance of districts but weighted factors might well be regarded as justifying some departure from quantitative equality. An approach which could give justification as a system of government which recognized both the quantity and the quality of its citizenry would be desirable.

This would give us a philosophical basis for a bicameral legislature; a checks and balance system not dependent upon the false prop of federalism but reflecting concern to protect the interdependency in the longrun interest of the State which might suffer from short range advantages to the most populated areas. Since the qualitative factors except for geography are subject to shift and change just as is population, the need for decennial reapportionment would be equally rational. A careful and documented approach by State leaders should assure a two-house legislature that reflects a democratic consideration of the representation of people without a reference necessarily to artificial and irrelevant county lines.

In seeking for what is relevant and useful in the changes that our present outmoded approaches clearly call for, Mr. Speaker, may we hope that our leaders will not be blinded by passionate desire to retain old advantages nor will they be blinded either by single-minded, narrow desire to achieve new advantages. Rather can we not seek stability with progress? Give sensible recognition to the qualities of man as well as to his quantity? Could we recognize that, although the two are not separable, one body of a State legislature could be selected emphasizing numbers and the other body could be selected emphasizing the factors of quality?

Regardless of the sound and fury that now wages between a Supreme Court which may have gone too far and legislative bodies which have unquestionably delayed too long in solving the problem of balanced representation, let us address our best efforts to the problem, not